

JAN 10 2005

**WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.**

700 Koppers Building

436 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818

Telephone: 412-471-8815 Facsimile: 412-471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com

**FACSIMILE INFORMATION SHEET**

Name of Individual: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
Company: United States Patent and Trademark Office  
City and State: Alexandria, VA

Facsimile Number: 703-872-9306

From: Ann Marie Cannoni, Esquire

Total Number of Pages: 8  
Date Transmitted: January 10, 2005  
CV01378K US  
Client No.: 4686 File No.: 048002

Message: Patent Application of: Harry R. Davis, et al.  
Serial No. 10/057,534  
Filed: January 25, 2002  
Examiner: Shengjun Wang  
Group Art Unit: 1617  
Entitled: Combinations of Bile Acid Sequestrant(s) and Sterol  
Absorption Inhibitor(s) and Treatments for Vascular Indications.

Transmittal Letter 1p. (2x)  
Request for Reconsideration (5pp)

If you do not receive all pages, please call back as soon as possible. The number is (412) 471-8815.

**STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY**

The information in this facsimile is privileged and confidential and is intended only for the use of the named recipient. Disclosure or copying of this document or its contents other than by the named recipient is prohibited. If this document is received in error, it should be returned to sender.

If there are any reception problems, please call 412-471-8815.

Attorney Docket No: CV01378K/4686-048002

**TRANSMITTAL LETTER****MAIL STOP AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Application No.: 10/057,534Filing Date: January 25, 2002Examiner: Shengjun WangArt Unit: 1617Invention: **COMBINATIONS OF BILE ACID SEQUESTRANT(S) AND STEROL ABSORPTION INHIBITOR(S) AND TREATMENTS FOR VASCULAR INDICATIONS**

Transmitted via facsimile herewith is a Request for Reconsideration in the above-identified application.

- ☐ Small Entity Status is/has been asserted for this application under 37 CFR 1.27.  
☐ A verified statement to establish small entity status under 37 CFR 1.27 is enclosed.  
☒ No additional claim fee is required.  
☐ The fee has been calculated as shown below:

No of Claims After Amendment	Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Small Entity Rate	Non-Small Entity Rate	Charge
Total <u>81</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>0</u>	x \$ 25.00	x \$ 50.00	\$ <u>0.00</u>
Indep. <u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>0</u>	x \$100.00	x \$200.00	\$ <u>0.00</u>
First Presentation of Multiple Dependent Claim/s			+ \$	+ \$	\$ <u>0.00</u>
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE					\$ <u>0.00</u>

- ☐ Check in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed for one-month extension of time.  
☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of the following fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 23-0650. Please refund any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-0650. An original and two copies of this sheet are enclosed.  
☒ Any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16.  
☒ Any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17.

January 10, 2005

Date

By: Ann Marie Cannoni

Registration No. 35,972

Webb Ziesenheim Logsdon Orkin

&amp; Hanson, P.C.

Attorney for Applicant

700 Koppers Building

436 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818

Telephone: (412) 471-8815

Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com

Attorney Docket No: CV01378K/4686-048002

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

## MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Application No.: 10/057,534Filing Date: January 25, 2002Examiner: Shengjun WangArt Unit: 1617Invention: COMBINATIONS OF BILE ACID SEQUESTRANT(S) AND STEROL ABSORPTION INHIBITOR(S) AND TREATMENTS FOR VASCULAR INDICATIONS

Transmitted via facsimile herewith is a Request for Reconsideration in the above-identified application.

- ☐ Small Entity Status is/has been asserted for this application under 37 CFR 1.27.  
☐ A verified statement to establish small entity status under 37 CFR 1.27 is enclosed.  
☒ No additional claim fee is required.  
☐ The fee has been calculated as shown below:

No of Claims After Amendment	Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Small Entity Rate	Non-Small Entity Rate	Charge
Total <u>81</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>0</u>	x \$ 25.00	x \$ 50.00	\$ <u>0.00</u>
Indep. <u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>0</u>	x \$100.00	x \$200.00	\$ <u>0.00</u>
First Presentation of Multiple Dependent Claim/s			+ \$	+ \$	\$ <u>0.00</u>
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE					\$ <u>0.00</u>

- ☐ Check in the amount of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed for one-month extension of time.  
☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of the following fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 23-0650. Please refund any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-0650. An original and two copies of this sheet are enclosed.  
☒ Any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16.  
☒ Any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17.

January 10, 2005

Date

By: 

Ann Marie Cannoni

Registration No. 35,972

Webb Ziesenheim Logsdon Orkin  
& Hanson, P.C.

Attorney for Applicant

700 Koppers Building

436 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818

Telephone: (412) 471-8815

Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 10 2005

Application No. 10/057,534  
Paper Dated: January 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**


In re: Patent Application of : PATENT APPLICATION  
Harry R. Davis et al. :  
Serial No.: 10/057,534 : Group Art Unit: 1617  
Filed: January 25, 2002 : Examiner: Shengjun Wang  
For: Combinations of Bile Acid Sequestrant(s) : Atty. Docket No.: CV01378K  
and Sterol Absorption Inhibitor(s) and :  
Treatments for Vascular Indications :

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

This Request for Reconsideration is being submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on November 16, 2004.

Claims 1-3, 5-28, 31-36, 70-72, 74-77, 79 and 80 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 29, 30, 37-69, 73, 78 and 81 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being non-elected. Claim 7 was canceled, without prejudice to filing one or more related applications directed to the canceled subject matter thereof.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number 703-872-9306 on January 10, 2005.	
Chris Reichert	
(Name of Person Faxing Paper)	
	1/10/2005
Signature	Date

{W0162910.1}

Application No. 10/057,534  
Paper Dated: January 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

At pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-28, 31-36, 70-72, 74-77, 79 and 80 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,846,966 ("Rosenblum et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,300,288 ("Albright"), U.S. Patent No. 4, 837,255 ("Dechow") and U.S. Patent No. 5,661,145 ("Davis").

For brevity, the reasons for rejection are not repeated herein but reference is made to the outstanding Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The law is replete with cases holding that there must be some suggestion or motivation in the prior art to combine the references. When making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Fritch, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The Examiner can satisfy this burden only by showing an objective teaching in the prior art, or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, which would lead an individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references [and/or the knowledge] in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Id.; In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The mere fact that the prior art could be modified does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the modification. In re Fritch, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1784; In re Laskowski, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397, 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1989); In re Gordon, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

"It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious....[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to

Application No. 10/057,534  
Paper Dated: January 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

deprecate the claimed invention." In re Fritch, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1784 (quoting In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1600).

"The ultimate determination of patentability must be based on consideration of the entire record, by a preponderance of evidence, with due consideration to the persuasiveness of any arguments and any secondary evidence." Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, (Rev. 1, Feb. 2003) § 716.01(d) and In re Oetiker, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

None of the cited references, taken alone or in combination as proposed in the final Office Action, suggests or discloses administering a combination of at least one bile acid sequestrant and about 10 milligrams of sterol absorption inhibitor of Formula (I) (such as ezetimibe).

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the references cited by the Examiner as rendering the claimed invention obvious is improper because there is no suggestion in the cited references to combine the claimed components of about 10 milligrams of sterol absorption inhibitor (such as ezetimibe) and cholestyramine.

In the In re Kerkoven case cited by the Examiner, the Court found the motivation or suggestion to combine two materials each disclosed in a separate reference from the fact that each reference taught the individual materials for the very same purpose as in the claimed combination. That is not the situation here.

Ezetimibe reduces blood cholesterol by inhibiting the absorption of cholesterol by the small intestine. See ZETIA™ (ezetimibe) Tablets Package Insert at column 1 (Merck/Schering-Plough Pharmaceuticals) (October 2002) included in the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 15, 2004.

The cholesterol content of the liver is derived predominantly from three sources. Id. The liver can synthesize cholesterol, take up cholesterol from the blood from circulating lipoproteins, or take up cholesterol absorbed by the small intestine. Id. Intestinal cholesterol is derived primarily from cholesterol secreted in the bile and from dietary cholesterol. Id.

Application No. 10/057,534  
Paper Dated: January 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

Ezetimibe has a mechanism of action that differs from those of other classes of cholesterol-reducing compounds (HMG CoA reductase inhibitors, bile acid sequestrants (resins), fibric acid derivatives, and plant stanols). Id.

Ezetimibe does not inhibit cholesterol synthesis in the liver (like HMG CoA reductase inhibitors), or increase bile acid excretion (like bile acid sequestrants). Id. Instead, ezetimibe localizes and appears to act at the brush border of the small intestine and inhibits the absorption of cholesterol, leading to a decrease in the delivery of intestinal cholesterol to the liver. Id. This causes a reduction of hepatic cholesterol stores and an increase in clearance of cholesterol from the blood; this distinct mechanism is complementary to that of HMG CoA reductase inhibitors. Id.

Ezetimibe does not operate by the same mechanism as either cholestyramine or cholesterol biosynthesis inhibitors. Because of the difference of the way that each component of the presently claimed combination acts, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is based upon an improper combination of references. There is no suggestion or motivation in the references to combine the claimed components that operate by these different mechanisms.

It is impermissible to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. *No motivation has been provided to select these two particular types of lipid management compounds out of numerous lipid management compounds.*

Further, *there is no motivation to select the claimed amount of about 10 milligrams of sterol absorption inhibitor (such as ezetimibe).* In re Boesch and Slaney relates to a nickel based alloy composition, not administration of a therapeutic agent to a human that is less predictable.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/057,534  
Paper Dated: January 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return an Initialed PTO-1449 form for each of the Information Disclosure Statements submitted on August 21, 2002 (EFS Nos. 17231 and 17260), April 4, 2003 and April 12, 2004 indicating that the Examiner has considered each of the references cited therein.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims in the present application are distinguishable from the cited prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 10, 2005



Ann Marie Cannoni

Registration No. 35,972

WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON  
ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.

700 Koppers Building

436 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Phone: (412) 471-8815

Fax: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: [acannoni@webblaw.com](mailto:acannoni@webblaw.com)